Student Learning Objective Quality Check

The purpose of this tool is to guide educators as they write and review teacher's Student Learning Objectives. It is not a rubric, checklist, nor a required step within the Edition II process. It is a guide to assist in determining if the Main Criteria are acceptable. If any item in the "Needs Revision" column applies, consider how to revise it so that the SLO is acceptable.

	Element	Acceptable	Needs Revision
PRIORITY OF CONTENT	**Objective Statement**	▪ Identifies specific knowledge and/or skills students should attain ▪ Focuses on appropriate knowledge and/or skills	▪ Too broad in scope of content ▪ Too narrow in scope of content ▪ Does not focus on appropriate knowledge and/or skills
	Rationale	▪ Provides a clear explanation of why this content is an appropriate focus and/or area of need ▪ Aligns to district and/or school priorities, if applicable	▪ Does not provide a clear explanation of why this content is an appropriate focus ▪ Does not align to district and/or school priorities, if applicable
	Aligned Standards	▪ Names exact standards or performance indicators (Common Core, GLEs, GSEs, national standards, etc.) ▪ Selected standards represent important content or skills for the grade level, course, or Objective Statement	▪ Does not name exact standards or performance indicators ▪ Selected standards do not represent important content or skills for the grade level, course, or Objective Statement
	Students	▪ Includes all students in the selected course(s) ▪ Specific number of students are identified	▪ Does not include all students in the selected course(s) ▪ Specific number of students are not identified
	Interval of Instruction	▪ The length of the interval of instruction is defined (e.g. year-long, semester, other) ▪ If interval of instruction is less than the length of the course (e.g. a year-long course which has two curricular-distinct semesters), justification is provided in the Rationale.	▪ The length of the interval of instruction is not defined ▪ Sufficient justification is not included in the Rationale if length of interval of instruction is less than the length of the course (e.g. a year-long course which has two curricular-distinct semesters)
RIGOR OF TARGET	**Baseline Data**	▪ Data about current student performance is included ▪ Data is from multiple evidence sources, when necessary, and of the highest-quality sources possible ▪ Data source(s) align to the skills/and or content focus of the SLO ▪ Data may be included about subgroups of students, individual students, or a similar group of students (i.e., students in same grade/course in previous years, or students' past performance)	▪ Data about current student performance or past student performance is not included ▪ More data seems necessary to gauge students' baselines ▪ Data source(s) do not show enough necessary skills or content knowledge to inform the SLO
	Target(s)	▪ Target(s) are measurable ▪ Target(s) are rigorous, yet attainable for all students ▪ Target(s) are tiered, if appropriate	▪ Target(s) are not clearly measureable ▪ Target(s) are not rigorous or attainable for all students ▪ Target would be more appropriate if tiered
	Rationale for Target(s)	▪ Target(s) are aligned with expectations for academic growth or mastery within the interval of instruction ▪ Students will be "on track" and/or gaps in achievement will be reduced if they meet the target(s) ▪ Rationale describes how the target(s) are rigorous, yet still attainable for all students	▪ Target(s) are not aligned with expectations for academic growth or mastery within the interval of instruction ▪ Students will be not be "on track" and/or gaps in achievement will not be reduced by the target(s) ▪ Rationale does not justify how the target(s) are rigorous, yet attainable for all students
QUALITY OF EVIDENCE	**Evidence Source(s)** *(see p.69 of Teacher Guide for more info)*	▪ Assessment(s) measure the identified content/skills of the objective ▪ Assessment(s) provide the specific data needed to determine whether the objective is met ▪ Description includes details about design of Evidence Source(s) (e.g. who created the assessment, its focus, item-types, and what it requires of students) ▪ Multiple Evidence Sources are used, when necessary	▪ Assessment do not measure the identified content/skills of the objective ▪ Assessment(s) do not provide the specific data needed to determine whether the objective is met ▪ Details of the Evidence Source and its creation are not included ▪ Multiple Evidence Sources are not used, but necessary
	Admin-istration	▪ Detailed explanation of assessment administration is provided, including how often, when it is administered, and by whom	▪ Sufficient, detailed explanation of assessment administration is not included
	Scoring	▪ Description articulates how the evidence will be collected and scored (including description of scoring guides, rubrics, or instructions). ▪ A collaborative scoring process is used when possible (e.g., a percentage of the evidence will be scored by more than one educator through collaborative scoring, double scoring, or blind scoring)	▪ Scoring does not describe scoring methods (e.g., scoring guides, rubrics, or instructions) ▪ Assessment(s) are scored by a single educator, although circumstances could allow for collaborative scoring

Overall:
▪ Do the Elements contain sufficient clarity in their description and language for the evaluator to clearly understand each section?
▪ Do the Elements fit together and align to create a complete SLO?